

REMARKS

Claims 57-93 are pending in the application. By this Response, claims 57, 65-67, 72, 80-82, 85, and 88 have been amended. All the amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of this application for allowance of all pending claims are hereby respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

In this Office Action, claims 57, 72 and 88 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, because the specification, does not reasonable provide enablement for “allocating , when at least one translatable component does not have corresponding translated component, at least a portion of the content for translation from the first language to a second language”. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Applicants direct the Examiner’s attention to paragraph 197 of the specification, which clearly defines the meaning of “designating” at least some translatable components in first language for translation into the second language. The word “designate” is well known and commonly understood in the art of computation. For example, the widely used online dictionary Answer.com defines “designate” to mean “indicate or specify”. See <http://www.answers.com/topic/designate>. In responding to the previous Office Action, where the Examiner raised the issue as to the meaning of “designating”, the Applicants amended claims 57, 72, and 88 to replace term “designating” using “allocating” for the purpose of clarifying the meaning of “designating”, which is commonly defined to mean “designate or set aside for a special purpose”.

<http://www.answers.com/topic/allocate?cat=biz-fin>. The Examiner further stated that “the specification does not enable any person skilled in the art”. The Applicants respectfully point out

that the legal standard for enablement is “undue experimentation”. The Applicants respectfully submit that it is well known in the art that a computer can readily designate some information for certain processing. For example, a computer can store some information in some register, the content of which is designated for some processing. As another example, a computer can also set a flag associated with some stored information to designate the stored information for some particular processing. Such techniques are well known and commonly used in computer operations, a person of ordinary skill in the art would be able to implement the claimed feature “designating ... at least a portion of the content for translation” without undue experimentation. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully contend that this claim element is enabled by the specification and request that the 112 rejection of claims 57, 72, and 88 based on the statutory enablement requirement be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 65-66, 70, 80-81 and 86 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which application regards as the invention. The Applicants respectfully point out that since claims 57, 72, and 88 have been amended to recite “designating”, the rejections of claims 65-66, 70, 80-81, and 86 for lacking antecedent basis for “designating” are now moot.

Claims 67-69 and 85 have been rejected for insufficient antecedent basis for “step of replicating a sessions.” By this Response, the claims have been amended to address the issue of antecedent basis. The Applicants believe that the amended claims overcome the rejection and, therefore, respectfully request that the rejections of claims 67-69 and 85 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 57-61, 63-66, 71-76, 78-84 and 87-93 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as being anticipated by Lakritz U.S. Patent No. 7,207,005 filed December 5, 2007 which is a

continuation of U.S. Patent No. 6,526,426 filed January 28, 1999. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The amended claims 57, 72, and 88 recite “accessing content in a first language, including content retrieved by following a link contained in web content”. The Applicants respectfully submit that Lakritz does not teach this claimed feature. Lakritz teaches a translation management and process control system (see Abstract, Column 3, line 16) that accesses content stored in a database and does not access content by following a link contained in web content, as recited in independent claims 57, 72, and 88.

It is well-settled that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since Lakritz fails to disclose each and every claim element recited in independent claims 57, 72, and 88, the Applicants respectfully submit that Lakritz does not anticipate claims 57, 72, and 88. Thus, claims 57, 72, and 88 are patentable.

Since independent claims 57, 72, and 88 are patentable for the reasons discussed above, claims 58-61, 63-66, 71-76, 78-84, 87, 89-93, that depend from independent claims 57, 72, and 88, respectively, are also patentable for at least the same reasons stated above with respect to their respective independent claims and for the additional features recited therein. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that rejections of claims 57-61, 63-66, 71-76, 78-84 and 87-93 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Accordingly, it is believed that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests an early and favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application. If there are any outstanding issues which might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's representative at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Stephen A. Becker
Registration No. 26,527

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 SAB:llg
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: January 16, 2008
WDC99 1508117-1.074869.0015

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**